REMARKS

The Examiner's Office Action of August 17, 2005 has been received and its contents reviewed. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the consideration given to the above-identified application, and for indicating that claims 3 and 4 as containing allowable subject matter and would be allowed if rewritten to overcome 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, rejection and to include all the features of the base claim and any intervening claims .

By the above actions, all independent claims 1 and 3 have been amended, claims 6-14 have been withdrawn from consideration. Accordingly, claims 1-5 are pending for consideration, of which claims 1 and 3 are independent. In view of these actions and the following remarks, reconsideration of this application is now requested.

Referring now to the detailed Office Action, the disclosure stands objected to as containing informalities. Particularly, page 20, lines 4 and 6: "liquid chamber 38" should be ---liquid chamber F-- , page 22, line 14: "stopper rubber 44" should be --stopper rubber 42 --, and page 47: all numerals in the abstract should be in parenthesis. In response, Applicants have amended the specification, as shown above, as suggested by the Examiner.

The drawing stand objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they fail to include reference signs mentioned in the description: "41b" on page 21, lines 22 and 24. Further, "40e" in Figs. 4, 5 and 12 is not mentioned in the description. In response, Applicants have amend "41b", on page 21 lines 21 and 24, to read as "42a". Further, Applicants have amended "40d and 40d", on page 20, lines 24 and 25, to read as "40d and 40e". As the specification has been amended, as shown above, drawing corrections are not necessary.

Claims 1, 2 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Yamada (JP 61-228140A). This rejection is respectfully traversed at least for the reasons provided below.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to further clarify the invention. According to the presently claimed invention, even when a rubber portion in the receiving member is in a state of being compressed in a vehicle body longitudinal direction, the receiving member is still

easily shear-deformed in a vertical direction because of the core body that is integrally provided in the receiving member and revolving, like a link, around an axis in a vehicle body traverse direction. This amendment is supported by the specification, page 6, lines 15-20.

Yamada discloses, in Fig. 1, a vibration proof mount device which supports a power plant mounted in the engine room in its transverse direction mainly at the front and rear sides. In contrast with Yamada, claim 1 of the present invention recites a vibration proof mount device which supports a power plant at the left and right end portions. In short, the presently claimed invention is structurally different from that of Yamada.

Further, in the invention in Yamada, a stopper rubber 12 is configured to receive a compressive force in a vertical direction, thereby making it possible for a front-side mount rubber 2 to limit the oscillation of the power plant in a roll direction between a lower metal fitting 9 (a body-side member) and an upper metal fitting 7 (a power plant side member) facing each other vertically. In contrast, the device of claim 1 has an oscillation limiting mechanism limiting the oscillation of the power plant in the roll direction, in which a receiving member is configured to at least receive a compressive force in a vehicle body longitudinal direction (front and rear directions) between a body-side member and a power plant side member facing each other in the vehicle body longitudinal direction.

In other words, the vibration proof mount device in claim 1 is further different in structure than the device in Yamada. Moreover, the directions of the compressive force generated by the rolling of the power plant are also different between the presently claimed invention and that of Yamada.

Still further, in the invention in Yamada, the stopper rubber 12 is formed thinner toward the collision top edge part and a hollow member 14 is buried in the stopper rubber 12, and in the above structure, the spring characteristic of the stopper rubber 12 has a progressive characteristic (Fig. 12). On the other hand, the receiving member recited in claim 1 includes a rubber portion and a core body that can revolve by a predetermined angle or more around an axis in a vehicle body transverse direction. According to claim 1, even when the rubber portion is compressed in the vehicle body longitudinal direction, the core body can still revolve like a link and thus the rubber portion is easily shear-deformed in the vertical direction.

Consequently, since each and every feature of the present claims is not taught (and is

not inherent) in the teachings of Yamada, as is required by MPEP Chapter 2131 in order to establish anticipation, the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 5, under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as anticipated by Yamada is improper.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of all the pending rejections and objections.

While the present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, should the Examiner find some issue to remain unresolved, or should any new issues arise, which could be eliminated through discussions with Applicants' representative, then the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone in order that the further prosecution of this application can thereby by expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

Luan C. Do
Registration No. 38,434

NIXON PEABODY LLP
Suite 900, 401 9th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128
(202) 585-8000